

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	I	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,571 10/16/20		10/16/2003	Tatsuya Suzuki	8070-1003	7159
466	7590	09/27/2005	EXAMINER		INER
YOUNG &	-		LINDSAY JR,	LINDSAY JR, WALTER LEE	
745 SOUTH 2ND FLOO	_	TREET	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ARLINGTO	ON, VA	22202	2812		
			DATE MAILED: 09/27/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Δ .		
V	Y	
1	•	

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		·10/685,571	SUZUKI ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Walter L. Lindsay, Jr.	2812				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	_•					
2a) 🗌	☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.						
3) 🗌	Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the merits is				
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.				
Dispositi	on of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 6,13,19,24 and 31-33 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 6,13,19,24 and 33 is/are rejected. 7) ⊠ Claim(s) 31 and 32 is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Applicati	ion Papers						
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 2.	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
2) Notice 3) Inform	t(s) se of References Cited (PTO-892) se of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	•				

Art Unit: 2812

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to an Amendment filed on 7/11/2005. Currently, claims 6, 13, 19, 24 and 31-33 are pending.

Specification

1. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 4. Claims 6, 13, 19, 24 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hugo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,300,202 filed on 10/9/2001) in view of Christenson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,835,667 filed 6/14/2002).

Application/Control Number: 10/685,571

Art Unit: 2812

Hugo show the method substantially as claimed in Figs. 1-4 and corresponding text as: forming an insulating film (101) on a semiconductor substrate (100), said insulating film comprising at least a high-k insulating film that has higher dielectric constant than that of the silicon oxide film (col. 2, line 48- col. 3, lines 17); and selectively removing said insulating film via wet etching to partially expose said surface of said semiconductor substrate (col. 5, lines 13-43) (claim 6).

Hugo lacks anticipation only in not explicitly teaching that: 1) selectively removing said insulating film via a wet etching with a chemical solution containing an organic solvent as a main component to partially expose said surface of said semiconductor substrate (claim 6); 2) the organic solvent is a solvent having polar group (claim 13); 3) the organic solvent is selected from the group consisting of: isopropyl alcohol; ethylene glycol; 2-heptanone; cyclopentanone; methylethyl ketone; glycol ether; propyleneglycol monomethyl ether; and propyleneglycol monomethyl acetate (claim 19); 4) the organic solvent is isopropyl alcohol, and said chemical solution contains not less than 90 % vol. of isopropyl alcohol (claim 24); and after said selectively removing said insulating film via a wet etching, rinsing the surface of said semiconductor substrate with an organic solvent, wherein said selectively removing said insulating film via a wet etching, said chemical solution includes a fluoride-containing compound (claim 33).

Christenson teaches the etching of High-K films. The High-K film can be etched selectively with an organic mixture that can consist of Isopropyl alcohol (col. 2, lines 49-58). This aids in the reduction of HF used in order to etch High-K dielectrics.

Application/Control Number: 10/685,571

Art Unit: 2812

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the method of Hugo by removing the insulating film with an organic solvent, which has a polar group and consist of an organic solvent from the group of: isopropyl alcohol; ethylene glycol; 2-heptanone; cyclopentanone; methylethyl ketone; glycol ether; propyleneglycol monomethyl ether; and propyleneglycol monomethyl acetate, and that the solvent contains no less than 90% vol. isopropyl alcohol as taught by Christenson, with the motivation that Christenson teaches that the addition of an organic solvent reduces the amount of HF used to etch High-K dielectrics.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 31 and 32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Walter L. Lindsay, Jr. whose telephone number is (571) 272-1674. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael S. Lebentritt can be reached on (571) 272-1873. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2812

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Walter L. Lindsay, Jr. Examiner Art Unit 2812

September 20, 2005